

Kathleen Sullivan (SBN 242261)
kathleensullivan@quinnemanuel.com
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
SULLIVAN LLP
51 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor
New York, NY 10010
Telephone: (212) 849-7000
Facsimile: (212) 849-7100

Sean S. Pak (SBN 219032)
seanpak@quinnemanuel.com
Amy H. Candido (SBN 237829)
amycandido@quinnemanuel.com
John M. Neukom (SBN 275887)
johnneukom@quinnemanuel.com.
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
SULLIVAN LLP
50 California Street, 22nd Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone: (415) 875-6600
Facsimile: (415) 875-6700

Mark Tung (SBN 245782)
marktung@quinnemanuel.com
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
SULLIVAN LLP
555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5th Floor
Redwood Shores, CA 94065
Telephone: (650) 801-5000
Facsimile: (650) 801-5100

Attorneys for Plaintiff Cisco Systems, Inc.

Steven Cherny (*admitted pro hac vice*)
steven.cherny@kirkland.com
KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
601 Lexington Avenue
New York, New York 10022
Telephone: (212) 446-4800
Facsimile: (212) 446-4900

Adam R. Alper (SBN 196834)
adam.alper@kirkland.com
KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
555 California Street
San Francisco, California 94104
Telephone: (415) 439-1400
Facsimile: (415) 439-1500

Michael W. De Vries (SBN 211001)
michael.devries@kirkland.com
KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
333 South Hope Street
Los Angeles, California 90071
Telephone: (213) 680-8400
Facsimile: (213) 680-8500

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN JOSE DIVISION

CISCO SYSTEMS, INC.,

Plaintiff,

vs.

ARISTA NETWORKS, INC.,

Defendant.

CASE NO. 5:14-cv-5344-BLF

**CISCO'S OPPOSITION TO ARISTA'S
MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE A
REPLY IN SUPPORT OF ITS MOTION
FOR RELIEF FROM THE
MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S NON-
DISPOSITIVE PRETRIAL ORDER**

Judge: Hon. Beth Labson Freeman

1 Plaintiff Cisco Systems, Inc. (“Cisco”) respectfully opposes Defendant Arista Networks,
2 Inc.’s (“Arista”) Motion for Leave To File A Reply In Support of Its Motion For Relief From The
3 Magistrate Judge’s Non-Dispositive Pretrial Order (“Motion For Leave”). Arista has not carried
4 its burden under Civil L.R. 7-9. Arista raises no “new,” material facts that were not already in its
5 possession before, during, and after it briefed and argued its Motion to Strike. Arista also presents
6 facts that were already presented to and considered by the Magistrate in briefing and at oral
7 argument. Arista should not be permitted to file more briefing about facts Arista has possessed all
8 along and additional arguments it had already presented or certainly could have presented before
9 the Magistrate. *See Marlyn Nutraceuticals, Inc. v. Mucos Pharma GmbH & Co.*, 571 F.3d 873,
10 880 (9th Cir. 2009) (“A motion for reconsideration may not be used to raise arguments or present
11 evidence for the first time when they could reasonably have been raised earlier in the litigation.”)
12 (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). For this reason, Arista’s Motion for Leave should
13 be denied.

14 Moreover, Arista’s allegations concerning versions miss the mark. This discovery dispute
15 is about comparing help descriptions on Arista-produced switches to Arista-produced source code
16 in order to confirm that those elements came from Arista as opposed to some third party. And that
17 is important because Arista allows and encourages users to customize its EOS source code
18 including the code underlying the EOS CLI. Arista, in fact, permits users to modify the
19 commands and outputs, including help descriptions. Accordingly, Cisco needed Arista’s source
20 code and Arista-produced switches from discovery in the case in order to confirm that Arista was
21 the party that copied Cisco’s help descriptions into EOS, as opposed to some third party. Without
22 both, Cisco could not have determined that Arista was the party that copied Cisco’s copyrighted
23 works in this fashion. That confirmation was particularly important here where Arista
24 affirmatively represented in this case that it had copied absolutely nothing from Cisco into its
25 source code.

26 Cisco respectfully requests that the Court deny Arista’s Motion for Leave. Nevertheless, if
27 the Court is inclined to grant Arista’s Motion for Leave to file a reply, Cisco respectfully requests
28 permission to file a responsive brief by Noon Pacific Time on Monday August 22, 2016.

1 Dated: August 19, 2016

Respectfully submitted,

2 /s/ John Neukom

3 Kathleen Sullivan (SBN 242261)
4 kathleensullivan@quinnemanuel.com
5 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
6 SULLIVAN LLP
7 51 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor
8 New York, NY 10010
9 Telephone: (212) 849-7000
10 Facsimile: (212) 849-7100

11 Sean S. Pak (SBN 219032)
12 seanpak@quinnemanuel.com
13 Amy H. Candido (SBN 237829)
14 amycandido@quinnemanuel.com
15 John M. Neukom (SBN 275887)
16 johnneukom@quinnemanuel.com.
17 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
18 SULLIVAN LLP
19 50 California Street, 22nd Floor
20 San Francisco, CA 94111
21 Telephone: (415) 875-6600
22 Facsimile: (415) 875-6700

23 Mark Tung (SBN 245782)
24 marktung@quinnemanuel.com
25 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
26 SULLIVAN LLP
27 555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5th Floor
28 Redwood Shores, CA 94065
Telephone: (650) 801-5000
Facsimile: (650) 801-5100

Steven Cherny *admitted pro hac vice*)
steven.cherny@kirkland.com
KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
601 Lexington Avenue
New York, New York 10022
Telephone: (212) 446-4800
Facsimile: (212) 446-4900

Adam R. Alper (SBN 196834)
adam.alper@kirkland.com
KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
555 California Street
San Francisco, California 94104
Telephone: (415) 439-1400
Facsimile: (415) 439-1500

Michael W. De Vries (SBN 211001)
michael.devries@kirkland.com
KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
333 South Hope Street

Los Angeles, California 90071
Telephone: (213) 680-8400
Facsimile: (213) 680-8500

Attorneys for Plaintiff Cisco Systems, Inc.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28